

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

B5

DATE: OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

OCT 28 2011

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

*Nai Rhew*  
Perry Rhew

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner seeks classification pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.<sup>1</sup> The petitioner seeks employment as a physician specializing in hematology-oncology. The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner qualifies for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that the petitioner had not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, counsel checked a box reading “My brief and/or additional evidence is attached.” Counsel did not indicate that any future supplement would follow. Therefore, the initial appellate submission constitutes the entire appeal. The petitioner submitted no exhibits on appeal except for a copy of the denial notice.

The Form I-290B includes a space for the petitioner to “[p]rovide a statement explaining any erroneous conclusion of law or fact in the decision being appealed.” In a one-sentence statement, counsel states: “The record reflects through [the petitioner’s] leading roles at prominent medical institutions along with his history of original publications and significant contributions to the fields of hematology and oncology that [the petitioner] has demonstrated that a waiver of the labor certification process would be in the national interest.” Counsel does not elaborate as to the nature of the claimed “leading roles” and “significant contributions.” The director, in the denial notice, had acknowledged the petitioner’s publication history, but found that “merely publishing some shared articles [does] not qualify the beneficiary for [the] National interest waiver.” The director also found that the petitioner “may have the experience and education to function as a high level Hematologist-Oncologist,” but that the petitioner had not established his “influence on the field.” Counsel cannot rebut the director’s findings simply by repeating the vague assertion that the petitioner’s work has been important.

In an accompanying statement, counsel states that the petitioner’s “original contributions” and “distinctions” distinguish the petitioner from his peers. Counsel, however, does not elaborate or explain how the director failed to take the petitioner’s previous evidence into consideration.

Counsel acknowledges that the medical societies to which the petitioner belongs do not require outstanding achievements, but states that “this is the norm.” The director, however, did not raise the

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO notes that the petitioner was previously a lawful permanent resident of the United States, but later abandoned that status. The petitioner filed Form I-407, Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status, on September 18, 2003.

issue of the petitioner's memberships as a basis for denial. Counsel further asserts generally that the petitioner "has judged the work of even senior peers" and "has been indispensable" to the university department where he works. Counsel does not, however, allege any specific factual or legal errors or other deficiencies in the director's decision. Counsel merely asserts that, given the petitioner's (unspecified) achievements, the director should have approved the petition.

Because counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the AAO must summarily dismiss the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.